

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action dated October 25, 2007, claims 1 – 22 and 32 were allowed and claims 23 – 31 were rejected. In response, Applicants have amended claim 23. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claim and the below-provided remarks.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation that claims 1 – 22 and 32 are allowed.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 23 – 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hama (U.S. Pat. Publ. No. 2004/0202171 A1) in view of Ishizaki et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,099,912 B2, hereinafter Ishizaki).

#### Claim 23

Applicants have amended claim 23 to include the limitation “redefining the explicitly identified set of VLAN IDs without having to redefine a set of VLAN IDs that result in traffic being forwarded within said customer-specific VPL.” Support for this amendment is found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, paragraph [0009].

Claim 23, as amended, recites:

“A method for managing network traffic comprising:  
establishing a customer-specific virtual private local area network (VPL)  
through a multiprotocol label switched (MPLS) domain;  
explicitly identifying a set of virtual local area network (VLAN)  
identifiers (IDs) for use with non-VPL traffic;  
receiving traffic from a customer at a provider edge device (PE), wherein  
said PE connects to other PEs via said MPLS domain;  
examining said traffic to identify non-VPL traffic;  
extracting identified non-VPL traffic from said customer-specific VPL;  
forwarding the non-extracted traffic within said customer-specific VPL;  
and  
*redefining the explicitly identified set of VLAN IDs without having to  
redefine a set of VLAN IDs that result in traffic being forwarded within said  
customer-specific VPL.*” (emphasis added)

Applicants assert that neither Hama nor Ishizaki teach or suggest the newly added limitation. In particular, Applicants assert that both Hama and Ishizaki teach that a set of VLAN IDs that define a default service would have to be redefined if the set of VLAN IDs for a first (non-default) service were to be redefined. Because neither Hama nor Ishizaki teach or suggest “redefining the explicitly identified set of VLAN IDs without having to redefine a set of VLAN IDs that result in traffic being forwarded within said customer-specific VPL” as recited in amended claim 23, Applicants assert that amended claim 23 is not rendered obvious from Hama in view of Ishizaka.

#### Dependent Claims 24 – 31

Claims 24 – 31 depend from claim 23. Applicants assert that these claims are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 23.

#### Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: January 24, 2008

Mark A. Wilson  
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham  
PMB: 348  
2530 Berryessa Road  
San Jose, CA 95132  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111